7/7/72

Dear Mary,

It was late yesterday when I got my mail. It was heavy, including your depreeing one of the 29th, postmarked the 30. One from Howard was as delayed. As I look at others unanswered, I not one sent from St. Louis 6/30and another 7/1 also delayed as long. nusual. Yours took over a week. It may be just an accident, but Gary's letter of "explanation" was stamped as having been found in some usuaed equipment. So, it was delayed. And in court day before yesterday, or leaving it, a U.S.Attorney made a crack to Bud,"I hear Weisberg was in to see you last week.That should teach you about leaving your door open." Well, it has been quite some time since I have seen Bud. His office door closes automatically. His inner office door, if open, permits eavesdropping only by those inside the office. And it has been longer than that since I've been in Bud's office. If he was not saying this just to nag Bud, there is but one thing with which it can coincide, my going into the CTIA office the day Ross wa there, the day before he came here, which in turn was the day before he left there. Perhaps I should have copied a paragraph out of Howard's delayed letter. He saw Ross here when I didn't, spoke to him separately, and was alone with him for a while at the bus statuon when I took Ross there. He says he feels he detected resentment against me in Ross and for his own reasons I do not recall didn't like or trust him. He also confirms that Ross lied to us about where he was going. Meanwhile, although you say and there is no doubt it is the truth that Ross was there, Gary in a letter the day before his "answer" notes that Rosss called him from the airport. Howard thinks Ross may have been on a mission for Ned and this accounts for his failure to provide a memo on something he told us Ned told him, not in confidence, that he apparently blurted out without realizing its meaning, as Howard and I did immediately.

The small note to Howard I wrote before beginning this tells you some of it. This wrecthed thing of Bud's of never keeping his word and never undoing the damage when he can but won't when we had a clear agreement that anything he got from me would be kept separate and away from any CTIA stuff will plague me forever. Two years ago, after it became just too much, he agreed to go through their files and remove. After several reminders it remains undone. I showed them all the d.c., but Jim tells me they saw a listing of it separately, and it turns out it is in the stuff I spent two months (and my own money) copying for Bud when he was supposed to file certain suits for me and then decided not to! There is no doubt that this is mine, Mine is pretty easily identified writing. Gary says simply that instead of using the copy I deposited with him for security, which he readily acknowledges, he wrote and got on on his own! That, of course, makes it right in his eyes, an what he did, which includes sending a copy to Wecht, which Jerry claims that he did, and I had discussed this with both and in person at some length and they both knew that I was opposed it it and why. Gary was here in January.When I wrote him asking him to return everything and stay away forever and he replied, I told him I had not sent copies of his letter to anyone but woudl if he wished or he could. Therefore, I do not enclose a copy. I see no reason not to if you want it but I'd rather play it cool and see if he complies with my request for his source on the list he says he used because it may turn out to be a copy I gave him, as with Jim Lesar, who still has it, by the way, at the CTIA, having made a copy of my copy for me! I am sending a copy of my letter to Sylvia. I'd intended to make a copy of it for you and Howard but didn't for two reasons, time pressures (I must get out from under this oppressive correspondence) and her reference to prescribed medications she suddenly stopped getting when her doctor died. It is, I am certain, quite innocent, but it is also subject to misinterpretation, and it is the kind of thing I do not believe should be kicking around in files. She rather politely criticized me for a variety of alleged sins, all of which I've responded to in a way that makes the complaint comprehensive or, where it alleges I feel you "betrayed" me, is quoted directly. She has to be sick. She accuses me of syaing 80bseene" things about her, etc., but at no point <u>responds</u> to my quite pointed letter to her, and there were five pages of pretty specific comment, single-spaced.

I have no objection to giving you copies of all. With your present concerns, I think you have enoughto worry about.

We had a pretty good idea of how Gary felt. And I do know that he put hiself in analysis. We felt the same way of him. If we'd ever gotten around to drawing up the will we'd planned, he have known this. Our Hyattstown property is potentially pretty valuable. All our indebtedness is ontop our home, not it. It is clear simply because the bank prefered security in the county in which we live. It is also our only security, the thing we will sell when we get a decent offer. He'd have been out heir.

Our home is worth twice the mortgage. Our surviving mothers are in their 80s and have other children. It is only that this is one of the things we never got around to that it wasn't on paper. Now it won't be. I don't know what has happened to Gary's ethics, for they seemed to be the best, one of the things that so impressed us about him. I suppose that I take a more rigid view than the popular in such matters because, as I recently wrote Howard of Gary, the cultural heritage of the Old Testament lingers in me. I do no consciously every do antyhigg wrong. This is not to say that I never am or do wrong, but I try to be honest. Perhaps this makes me feel more strongly about right and wrong, as I see them. And there has been a minor industry of getting and using my stuff. Sylvia, for example, had to know as soon as she saw Tink's book that every citation "according to a document recently discovered at the Archives" is a piracy from WWII. I don't think there is an exception and it is the most common singke source he cites. But she like Tink and for some reason didn't like me, despite her protestations, so this was ok to her.

Perhaps there is an answer in what I also can t comprehend inx a story I really should not tell and wouldn't except that it may clarify for you what is to both of us incomprehensible. You must keep this in confidence, unless you want to get Buck's appraisal. You will remember that Gary sent Ned to us, innocently, we felt afterward, leading us into a horrible and painful mess Lil will never forget. AFTER it was all over, he tells me that Ned was going to a shrink, which is how Gary met him, through his problems. Ned found out that a rpominent shrink was laying a woman patient Gary described as badly screwed up in the head. Some theraphy! So, this not only screwed her up even worse in the head, but Ned made a real mess of it by talking about it, with the obvious consequences to all parties. And he sends so untrustworthy and unstable a man to us without telling us this in advance? But I have no doubt that he did not mean anything but good in sedning Ned here. I do think his judgement was miserable in not letting me judge, not letting me know what he knew was within Ned's capabilities. He also didn t tell me and I found out from Ned's blurting it out that Ned's wife is against all his assassination work and is a money-grubber. No matter how much Ned has, it isn't enough for her. She forced him to spend all his liquid assets on a more luxurious home than anyone requires. Why not? Didn't she marry into the General Mills and Weyerhauser fortunes? If it is not certain, it is possible that had I known these things at the beginning, my dealings with Ned would have been different. There'd have been a much more specific contract, for example, not so much left to trust. There is a written agreement and he has violated it. But what good is any agreement when you haven't the money for a lawyer?

I am aware that the cumulative oppression of our many problems, more than you know of, can influence my reactions and judgement, but in this case I think they have not. To me this is a very simple matter of deliberate breech of trust in which Gary says just about what Jerry did, that it is the requirement of "good conscience".

I think it is quite possible that in Gary's case he was motivated by what he told himself was ax good thing. The incomprehensible part is that after the long talk I had with him in January, even if he felt this way, he would not have at least discussed it with me. His circumstances have changed. His financial condition is good. He has cleared himself and bought a new car. He can now afford phone calls. I think thereis a common galling on the part of those who have dropped out. They want very much not to have, want very much for a quich solution which to them would be a selfjustification to a nagging conscience because they have dropped out. This may be a simplistic psychological explanation, but I haven't thought of anything that comes as close to explaining any of this to me except where I have decided that self-interest is the case. In these cases, it may also not be conscious. But it is simply impossible to go over my Ned and Wecht files without this smacking you in both eyes. Wecht can get enormous commercial gain from this. He has, for example, in addition to his public job of coroner and his professorial post anincome from a malpractise business that is part of his consultancy business. He has a separate office for this in the Frick Building. But the awful thing is that this has the potential for ruining him if the press is briefed, as I would suppose someone in the government will arrange. One Long John broadcast that stunned ever Jerry, but not enough, is sufficient. All that one reporter need do when he holds his press conference is quote it and say, "Doctor, did you say this?" Every reporter there, inevitably, will be completely turned off. Especially when he has done no original work, has said what can't be supported by the total of everyone's work, was stupid to say, and will be called plagiarism from Garrison'd worst nightmare.

This is part of what we face.

Inviting Gary to Dallas would do him no good and would overburden you and Buck. But if you want to, lets wait and see how he responds to what I wrote him after he blandly told me he did it. And said it was right. Besides, he won t do it. Just before this he had written to tell me me that although he had planned to go to Europe with Jerry in August, he now thinks it will be impossible because of work pressures. I am without any doubt about his sincerity in his work and his dedication to it.

Before getting to the part of your letter that troubles me most, your personal and very serious problems, two more things: if you really want to talk to Gary, let it wait until after this thing has run its course. Nothing done can be undone. Before then, you and buck come up here and you read everything I have. This thing Gary has been responsible for, and he has been separately from Jerry, can t be separated from the Ned thing, which he knew in detail, aside from having originated. He also knew of and had copies of all my quite unsatisfactory correspondence with Ned and then, when he learned what Ned was up to, simple copped out. Wouldn't even find the time to try to talk to him. I dont think the parts can be separated. Ned is the one who really pressured Marshall, although such liberal nuts as Mrs. Pomerance joined it.

If you have any kind of a file on any of the people in The Watergate Caper and can find time, it can be important to me and to us. Please keep this in confidence: I have a prima facie case of Hunt's killing a deal I had with the Saturday Evening Post in 1965, when he was still at CIA and was also at the literary agency supposedly handling me. You can see the letters when you are here and they come close to speaking for themselves. I've told Jim this and raised the question of a suit vs CIA for damages, and idea that made him smile. Offhand he agrees I have enough to get into court with. I can t do it myself, but with legal help this might turn into something! I didn t get to read yesterday's paper yet, or to look at what Lil clipped from it for me. This headline, which relates to Teddy, tells te story, "Bug Suspect Said To Seek Kennedy Data". And in the White House library, which confirmed it. If I haven't told you, I believe Hunt and Barker are the Frank Bender and Bernie of the Bay of Pigs fiasco, that fake aliases were immediately leaked to keep the press from independent inquiry.

At this point Lil had breakfast, a little later than usual because she has been having and today has headaches, sometimes with an unsteadiness. She spentalmost all the time Jim was here yesterday in bed and was aslpee when he left. While eating I got an idea and checked my files and while taking my morning walk I did some thinking the result make some things prettyclear. Enclosed carbons will explain.

Because of the way she felt yesterday and does today, I didn't give your letter to read. When she is what for these days is herself again I'll discuss it with her. I must admit that at one point in that gloomy thing I laughed to myself and I'm sure my face, unseen by Lil, smiled with it. "That's Buck," I said to myself when you said he had taken a suite at the hospital. It is exactly what I would have expected him to do, probably with total disregard for the cost rather than without thinking of it. Before skimming your letter again, I want to get to the part that seems as incomprehensible to me as it does to you. I don't know Bobby as you people do. I was prejdudiced in her favor by the things you said, and while I generally do not notice such things, when I saw her I thought she'd let her self go a bit, was a bit unfeminine, less attractive than she could have been. It this is a fair observation, as you will know where I cannot, then what I have come to think may be someplace close if not on the bullseye.

It comes to me that except for the opening and a few details, Lil knows most of this because you told us. As soon as I knew it was you, as you may recall, Ihollered to her to pick up the extension because it was you. After we finished, after the shock had begun to dull and we began to talk about this awful series of things that has befallen you all, she said what I suppose most men like was the case with me would not think of, that it was a helluva note for Bobby to con you into doing her housework for her with the kind of day you put in. My defense was but she was pregnant. Lil's response was there is no problem for a pregnant woman to do the things she loaded onto you. I Believe Lil in this, Mary. You will know better than either of us, having had your own children. Now if that is true, add this is a clue.

I think there is no doubt that Bobby had all the legitimate cause for complaint you itemized to me and perhaps more. On the other hand, despite their obvious errors, from what I saw of two of your boys, I would have to say that they are pretty decent young men. Like

so many of their generation, they are turned off on the world and society and it influences their thinking, actions, attitudes - all their lives in all aspects. Sometime other men are the victins, sometimes other women, sometimes the parents, sometimes the paretns are the last straw. (I have in mind so many of the kids who are alienated because their well-to-do parents make a good and socially-acceptable living by what the kids regards as dishonesty but by the standards of a corrupt society are not.) So, I think at the outset, despite the legitimacy of any and all complaints against Larry, he is entitled to this and I think proper and relevant defense, if only in your thinking of him. He is, to put it another way, entitled to more understanding and sympathy than loving parents consider a blind obligation to a child. Offspring would be better. He's no kid. If this does not make right out of wrong, it is a different context than blind parental fidelity.

There would seem to be no possibility of doubting Bobbie's love for him as of the time I was there. Perhaps she felt is was over and was just sweating it out, hoping he'd take root again. But I think that any judgement of her behavio has to consider the situation she was in once she was pregnant and didn t have an abortion. She was going to be saddled with a child to raise and support and an errant, undependable, perhaps unloving husband. He could turn on, as she could see it, and at any time turn off again. I would think that this an these and coming problems would be very much in the thinking of a pregnant woman. That she dropped her divorce action I think supports my reasoning.

I've looked at your letter to get some facts and note you feel the same way I did about her appearance when I was there. You put it more strikgly, "bedraggled". In looking I think I find a further clue in an analysis, what immediately follows:"Well, she had really been taking care of her appearance and is beautiful and well-dressed."

Let's put all these clues together. It is not with certainty that a stranger can do this, but my purpose is not to tell myself but to help you and Buck figure out the seemingly incomprehensible, what of all this shocking bad news stunned me worse, the time she picked to tell Larry she was finally breaking it up. After at least six + years of putting up with what has to be hard for any woman.

Consider that she did not break off when she was pregnant and did not get an abortion. Consider that she started loading you with work she knew she shouldn't, too. Or, taking advantage of you. I think is this was not her way all the time it reflects a state of mind. Now, all of a sudden, she finds that in addition to a baby to raise she has at best a permanently-crippled husband to spend the rest of his life with, another load. That she would want to buck him back to you is comprehensible. What isn't is the timing of telling. It really isn't to me yet, but it is so inhuman that I think it has to be out-of-character for anyone except a beast or the seriously-troubled, emotionally. All of a sudden all those wasted years came flooding back on her and the painful ones ahead must have been an oppressive thought. I'm not skilled in the workings of the mind, but I think some kind of self-defense/self-preservation mechanism took over, that he understandable resentment of so many years added to it made decent behavior impossible for her ego (in the non-great-guy sense, the one that everyone has and needs). I think it is possible to understand this as the final need of her mind after all those years and blows to her self-esteem, that she just could not cope with all of that and the bleak future.

Don't just feel sorry for Larry for his truthful confession, that he can't understand why both of you have put up with everything. Try and use that as a means of getting him out of what has to a very severe depression. As you know, I have told you I fit no pattern. I have not practised Judaism since I was a kid. Nor am I true to all the Old Testament philosophy. For example, I find the turning of the cheek preferable to an eye for an eye. But my favorite book of the bible (also JFK's, by the way) is Ecclesiastes. At first it seems despressing. It isn t if it is thought about. I think that if Larry repeads it as an expression of philosophyrather than as a preaching of religion, it may help him work his way out of at least some of this in his own mind. Maybe you'd better reread it first, for you know his mind better than I. There is no need for Larry to be a vegetable, not if he wants not to be. I think this is the part you and Buck should work on, like Wallace is working on his physical theraphy. It will be hard. But the doing in itself will be a reward to him, will have meaning, besides leading to an improvement in his circumstances.

Please keep us posted. Hope everything goes as well as it can.

Best,